Remarks

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the present U.S. Patent application as amended herein. Claims 1, 8 and 15 have been amended. No claims have been added. Thus, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-17, 19 and 20 are pending.

CLAIM REJECTION - 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-13 and 15-17, 19-20 remain rejected as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,177,931 issued to Alexander, et al. (*Alexander*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 11-13, 15-17, 19 and 20 are not anticipated by *Alexander*.

Claim 1 as amended recites:

providing a graphical user interface indicating at least one season premiere episode corresponding to at least one upcoming season series of television programs; and

in response to the selection of one or more season premiere episodes through said interface, determining a future schedule including at least new programs of the upcoming series, and automatically recording the season series in accordance with at least the future schedule.

Thus, Applicants claim indicating a plurality of season premiere episodes via a graphical user interface, selecting a season premiere episode, and automatically determining a schedule for at least the new programs in the upcoming series, and recording the series according to that schedule. Claims 8 and 15 recite similar limitations.

It is respectfully submitted *Alexander* merely shows an advertisement for a season premiere episode. See Figs 10A and 10B. *Alexander* further discloses a programming recorder may be set to record at a particular time. In particular, as discussed in the portion of *Alexander* at col. 21 lines 39-67 relied on by the Office:

Pressing the Watch button also places the show in the Record/Watch Schedule for the duration of the show to allow the user to set the frequency to *daily* or *weekly*. If the show is not currently on, pressing the Left Action button places the show in the Record/Watch Schedule or; pressing the Enter/Select button tunes to the channel related to the show in the ad. **Shows added to the Record/Watch**Schedule may be set to be viewed: *once*, *daily*, or *weekly*. The Watch feature and related Action button labels operate in the same way as if scheduling a show to watch from the Grid.

A simple once, daily or weekly schedule is <u>not</u> what is claimed. Thus *Alexander* does <u>not</u> disclose automatically recording a season series in response to selection of a season premiere episode as recited. And, in particular, *Alexander* does not disclose determining a schedule of at least new episodes in the series and recording the series in accord with the determined schedule.

Therefore, the portions of *Alexander* relied on by the Office cannot be said to anticipate the invention of claims 1, 8 and 15, nor was such support found through cursory general review of other portions of *Alexander*.

Claims 2 and 4-6 depend from claim 1. Claims 9 and 11-13 depend from claim 8. Claims 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from claim 15. Because dependent claims include the limitations of the claims from which they depend, Applicants submit that claims 2, 4-6, 9, 11-13, 16, 17, 19 and 20 are not anticipated by *Alexander* for at least the reasons set forth above.

CLAIM REJECTIONS - 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 7 and 14 were rejected as being unpatentable over *Alexander* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,020,880 issued to Naimpally (*Naimpally*). For at least the reasons set forth below, Applicants submit that claims 7 and 14 are not rendered obvious by *Alexander* and *Naimpally*.

-6-

Atty. Docket No. INTL-0413-US (P8908) Examiner Christopher O. Onuaku TC/A.U. 2616

Application No. 09/605,799 Amendment dated February 8, 2006

Response to Office Action of September 8, 2005

Naimpally is cited to teach acquiring program data over the Internet. See ¶4 of

the Office Action. Putting aside for a moment whether there is motivation to support the

proposed combination, Applicants submit reliance on this reference is mooted in light of

the deficiencies of Alexander set forth above. Naimpally does not cure the deficiencies of

Alexander, therefore no combination of Alexander and Naimpally can teach or suggest

the invention as recited in claims 7 and 14.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicants submit that the rejections have been

overcome. Therefore, claims 1, 2, 4-9, 11-17, 19 and 20 are in condition for allowance

and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact

the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present

application. Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit

Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: February 8, 2006

Steven D. Yates

/ Steven D. Yates # 42,242 /

Patent Attorney

Intel Corporation

(503) 264-6589

c/o Blakely, Sokoloff, Taylor & Zafman, LLP

12400 Wilshire Boulevard

Seventh Floor

Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026

-7-